



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

are in varying degrees sadly stricken and laboring under adverse conditions from which they will not recover for many years. Changes of a very radical character have taken place. The United States has become a great creditor nation. She has lent certain governments of Europe more than \$9,000,000,000, and as a result of the enormous excess of our exports there is an additional commercial indebtedness of foreign nations to our own of perhaps not less than \$4,000,000,000.

Three Recourses for Europe

There are only three ways in which Europe can meet her part of her indebtedness, namely, by the establishment of private credits, by the shipment of gold or of commodities. It is difficult for Europe to discover the requisite securities as a basis for the necessary credits. Europe is not in a position at the present time to send us the amount of gold which would be needed and we could not view further large imports of gold into this country without concern. The result, to say the least, would be a larger disarrangement of international exchange and disturbance of international trade. If we wish to have Europe settle her debts, governmental or commercial, we must be prepared to buy from her, and if we wish to assist Europe and ourselves by the export of food, of raw materials, or finished products, we must be prepared to welcome commodities which we need and which Europe will be prepared, with no little pain, to send us.

Not a Time for Tariff Barriers

Clearly this is no time for the erection here of high trade barriers. It would strike a blow at the large and successful efforts which have been made by many of our great industries to place themselves on an export basis. It would stand in the way of the normal readjustment of business conditions throughout the world, which is as vital to the welfare of this country as to that of all the other nations. The United States has a duty to itself as well as to the world, and it can discharge this duty by widening, not by contracting, its world markets.

AMERICA AND THE MANDATES OF THE LEAGUE

On February 24 the Department of State made public a communication which two days before had been presented to the Council of the League of Nations, sitting in Paris. The Council, surprised and somewhat perturbed by the communication, at once suspended discussion of the "mandate" issue, and the representatives of the dominant powers in the Council at once got in touch with the Supreme Council of the Allies, awaiting orders from Paris, London, Italy, and Rome. This reference, while humiliating to the League's Council and at the same time illuminating as to where "power" actually sits, at the same time enabled the foreign offices of the respective capitals to consult on a concrete case, and to meet a challenge from the United States that sooner or later was bound to be given and faced.

The appended note from the Department of State should be read in conjunction with an earlier note to Great Britain relative to Mesopotamia (see pages 390-392, ADVOCATE OF PEACE, December, 1920), which had not been answered by Great Britain at the time when the note to the League Council was sent.

The note to the League's Council follows:

To the President and Members of the Council of the League of Nations.

GENTLEMEN: The Government of the United States has received information that the Council of the League of Nations at its meeting which is to be held in Paris on this

date (February 21) proposes to consider at length the subject of mandates, including their terms, provisions, and allocation, and accordingly takes this opportunity to deliver to the Council of the League of Nations a copy of its note addressed under date of November 20, 1920, to His Excellency Lord Curzon of Kedleston, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in which the views of the United States are quite fully set forth regarding the nature of the responsibilities of mandatory powers.

The attention of the Council of the League of Nations is particularly invited to the request therein made on behalf of this government that the draft mandate forms intended to be submitted to the League of Nations be communicated to this government for its consideration before submission to the Council of the League, in order that the Council might thus have before it an expression of the opinion of the Government of the United States on the form of such mandates and a clear indication of the basis upon which the approval of this government, which is essential to the validity of any determinations which may be reached, might be anticipated and received.

For Publicity of Plans

It was furthermore stated in said note that the establishment of the mandate principle, a new principle in international relations and one in which the public opinion of the world is taking special interest, would seem to require the frankest discussion from all pertinent points of view, and the opinion was expressed that suitable publicity should be given to the drafts of mandates which it is the intention to submit to the Council, in order that the fullest opportunity might be afforded to consider their terms in relation to the obligations assumed by the mandatory powers and the respective interests of all governments who deem themselves concerned or affected.

A copy of this note was transmitted to the governments of France and Italy, requesting an interpretation by each government of the provisions of the agreement between Great Britain, Italy, and France, signed at Sèvres on August 10, 1920, relating to the creation of spheres of special interest in Anatolia, in the light of this government's note to the British Government of November 20, 1920.

A reply has thus far been received only from the French Government, in which attention is directed to Article X of the so-called Sèvres Treaty, which provides in favor of nationals of third powers for all economic purposes free access to the so-called zones of special interest.

The Pacific Mandate

This government is also in receipt of information that the Council of the League of Nations at its meeting at Geneva on December 17 last approved, among other mandates, a mandate to Japan embracing "all the former German islands situated in the Pacific Ocean and lying north of the equator." The text of this mandate to Japan, which was received by this government and which, according to available information, was approved by the Council, contains the following statement:

"Whereas, the principals of the allied and associated powers agreed that, in accordance with Article XXII, part 1 (Covenant of the League of Nations) of the said treaty, a mandate should be conferred upon His Majesty the Emperor of Japan to administer the said islands, and have proposed that the mandate should be formulated in the following terms," &c.

The Government of the United States takes this opportunity, respectfully and in the most friendly spirit, to submit to the President and members of the Council of the League that the statement above quoted is incorrect and is not an accurate recital of the facts.

On the contrary, the United States, which is distinctly included in the very definite and constantly used descriptive phrase "The principal allied and associated powers," has not agreed to the terms or provisions of the mandate which is embodied in this text, nor has it agreed that a mandate should be conferred upon Japan covering all the former German islands situated in the Pacific Ocean and lying north of the equator.

Never Agreed on Yap

The United States has never given its consent to the inclusion of the Island of Yap in any proposed mandate to Japan, but, on the other hand, at the time of the discussion of a mandate covering the former German islands in the Pacific north of the equator, and in the course of said discussion, President Wilson, acting on behalf of this government, was particular to stipulate that the question of the disposition of the Island of Yap should be reserved for future consideration.

Subsequently this government was informed that certain of the principal allied and associated powers were under the impression that the reported decision of the Supreme Council, sometimes described as the Council of Four, taken at its meeting on May 7, 1919, included or inserted the Island of Yap in the proposed mandate to Japan.

This government, in notes addressed to the governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, has set forth at length its contention that Yap had, in fact, been excepted from this proposed mandate and was not to be included therein. Furthermore, by direction of President Wilson, the respective governments above mentioned were informed that the Government of the United States could not concur in the reported decision of May 7, 1919, of the Supreme Council.

The information was further conveyed that the reservations which had previously been made by this government regarding the Island of Yap were based on the view that the Island of Yap necessarily constitutes an indispensable part of any scheme or practicable arrangement of cable communication in the Pacific, and that its free and unhampered use should not be limited or controlled by any one power.

Position Was Made Clear

While this government has never assented to the inclusion of the Island of Yap in the proposed mandate to Japan, it may be pointed out that even if one or more of the other principal allied and associated powers were under a misapprehension as to the inclusion of this island in the reported decision on May 7, 1919, nevertheless the notes, above mentioned, of the Government of the United States makes clear the position of this government in the matter.

At the same time, when the several notes were addressed to the respective governments above mentioned, a final agreement had not been reached as to the terms and allocation of mandates covering the former German islands in the Pacific.

Wherefore the position taken in the matter by the President on behalf of this government and clearly set forth in the notes referred to necessarily had the result of effectively withdrawing any suggestion or implication of assent, mistakenly imputed to this government, long before December 17, 1920, the date of the Council's meeting at Geneva.

As one of the principal allied and associated powers, the United States has an equal concern and an inseparable interest with the other principal allied and associated powers in the overseas possessions of Germany and concededly an equal voice in their disposition, which it is respectfully submitted cannot be undertaken or effectuated without its assent. The Government of the United States therefore respectfully states that it cannot regard itself as bound by the terms and provisions of said mandate and desires to record its protest against the reported decision of December 17, last, of the Council of the League of Nations in relation thereto, and at the same time to request that the Council, having obviously acted under a misapprehension of the facts, should reopen the question for the further consideration, which the proper settlement of it clearly requires.

Accept, gentlemen, the assurance of my high consideration.

BAINBRIDGE COLBY,
Secretary of State.

LEAGUE COUNCIL SIDESTEPS MANDATE ISSUE

On March 1 the Council of the League of Nations made public the substance of its reply to the above communication of the United States, Arthur J. Balfour, it is generally understood, being the drafter of the note. Openly and covertly it discloses the significant fact that the superior body in shap-

ing developments in Europe today is the Supreme Council of the Associated and Allied Powers, from which, in some respects, the United States has withdrawn and from which, in other respects, it has not. Thus, for instance, the United States has formally declined to sit longer with the Reparations Commission; but its army is still in the Coblenz region and its representative is serving on the Danube Commission.

We append the text of the League Council's reply:

To the Secretary of State of the United States of America:

I am directed by the Council of the League of Nations to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of February 21 on certain matters connected with the mandates which under the provisions of the covenant will define the responsibilities and limit the powers of the governments entrusted with the administration of various territories outside Europe formerly in the possession of Germany and Turkey.

The main points brought out in the American note, if I may be permitted to summarize them, are that the United States must be consulted before any mandates are allotted or defined, and that the frankest discussion from all pertinent points of view should be encouraged. In the "A" mandates, exception is taken to the possible limitation of commercial opportunity as regards oil in Mesopotamia, and in the "C" mandates to the allocation of the Island of Yap to Japan.

The Council wishes to express its deep satisfaction at the interest shown by your government in this question, which the Council has long felt to be among the most important assigned to the League. Undoubtedly also it is one of the most difficult, and the Council not only welcomes, but feels justified in claiming, the sympathy and support of the governments which devised the scheme which the Council is required to administer.

Right to Confer

The most fundamental contention brought forward by the American note is that the "approval of the United States of America is essential to the validity of any determination which may be reached" respecting the mandates which have been or may be submitted to the judgment of the Council. The United States was one of the leading actors both in the war and in the negotiations for peace. The rights which it acquired are not likely to be challenged in any quarter. But the American Government will itself recognize that the situation is complicated by the fact that the United States, for reasons which the Council would be the last to question, has so far abstained from ratifying the peace treaty and has not taken her seat on the Council of the League of Nations.

The Council might easily have dwelt on the controversial aspects of the American note. But this procedure would illy represent their true attitude. They prefer to examine the subject from the broad basis of international co-operation and friendship, in the belief that this course will appeal to the spirit of justice of the government and people of the United States.

The Council has taken several important decisions with regard to mandates which it confidently hopes will command themselves to the American Government.

Postpones Action

The Council had already determined on February 21, before the receipt of the American note, to postpone the consideration of the "A" mandates for former Turkish possessions, including Mesopotamia. No conclusions will therefore be reached with regard to "A" mandates until the United States Government has had an opportunity to express its views.

The Council had expected to approve finally, at the session now being held, the "B" mandates for the former Central African colonies for Germany.

Action is Deferred

In view of the desire expressed by the United States, the Council is, however, deferring its consideration of these man-

dates until its next session, which will probably take place in May or June. It is hoped that the delay will not hamper the administrative progress of these territories.

The Council invites the United States to take part in the discussions at its forthcoming meeting, when the final decisions as to the "A" and "B" mandates will, it is hoped, be taken. A problem so intricate and involved as that of the mandates can hardly be handled by the interchange of formal notes. It can only be satisfactorily solved by personal contact and by direct exchange of opinion.

Not only do such direct negotiations which correspond to the true spirit of the League of Nations effect an increase of freedom, flexibility, and speed, but they create a spirit of mutual good will and co-operation among people meeting around the same table.

The Island of Yap

Regarding the third type of mandates, the "C" group of former German possessions in South Africa and the Pacific, the Council has not the advantage of the same liberty of action as in the "A" and "B" types. The "C" mandates were defined by the Council at its meeting in Geneva on December 17, 1920. The main American objection in this case, it is understood from Your Excellency's note, is to the effect that the Island of Yap was included by the Council in the mandate given to Japan, whereas Your Excellency states that the United States has on several occasions refused to agree to the allocation of this island to any one State.

The League of Nations Council would remind Your Excellency that the allocation of all the mandated territories is a function of the Supreme Council and not of the Council of the League. The League is concerned not with the allocation, but with the administration of these territories. Having been notified in the name of the allied and associated powers that all the islands north of the equator had been allocated to Japan, the Council of the League merely fulfilled its responsibility of defining the terms of the mandate.

Consequently, if a misunderstanding exists as to the allocation of the Island of Yap, that misunderstanding would seem to be between the principal allied powers rather than between the United States and the League. However, in view of the American contention, the Council of the League has hastened to forward the American note to the governments of France, Great Britain, Italy, and Japan.

The Council hopes that explanations will prove satisfactory to the United States Government, and that reciprocal good will will find a solution in harmony with the generous spirit which inspired the principle of the mandates.

(Signed) *GASTAO DA CUNCHA,*
President of the Council of the
League of Nations.

PARIS, March 1, 1921.

NEW HAMPSHIRE PEACE SOCIETY'S REPORT

By MARY N. CHASE, Secretary

The chief work of the New Hampshire Peace Society continues to be International Correspondence to promote International Good Will. Your secretary is happy to report that the movement during the past year has progressed by leaps and bounds. Individuals or schools in twenty-one States in this country are co-operating, scattered from Massachusetts to Oregon and extending as far south as Tennessee. Eight colleges and many secondary schools are assisting in this important work of trying to lay the foundations of a lasting peace.

Deeply impressed that it was our duty to prove a good neighbor to Mexico, your secretary, at the suggestion of Ambassador Bonillas, sent a letter last February to the thirty-six governors of Mexico. Over twenty most cordial and courteous replies were received. Many of them referred

the letter to educational leaders, and as a result we are now corresponding with eight schools and also several individuals who have left school. Twenty in Proctor Academy are sending letters to Mexico, and other schools are helping, notably the high school in Greenfield, Mass.; Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tenn., and a large school in Perry, Iowa.

Last spring Francisco Vela, a native Mexican and a student in Harvard Medical School, visited Proctor Academy and gave two delightful talks on Mexico—one before the student body and the other at a public meeting. The young people were greatly attracted by his charming personality and became very enthusiastic over the Mexican correspondence as a result of his visit. This personal contact with an educated Mexican and the delightful and friendly letters received from Mexico have changed their ideas regarding Mexico. They admire the grace and elegance of many of the letters received, and their love of beauty as shown in the pictures sent us.

In Japan we have corresponded for several years with a government school where there are 500 girls. Last Christmas they sent Proctor Academy a present of over twenty beautiful Japanese napkins, a valuable gift. A short time ago I heard from two Japanese young men in the Y. M. C. A. English school in Tokyo, stating they wished correspondents. I trust this may lead to a more extended correspondence with Japan, as several schools have expressed a desire to correspond with the Japanese.

Our correspondence begun with French refugees has continued. In Proctor Academy we have a Committee on French Relations which has members from all the classes. We also have three class committees—on Mexican Relations, on Foreign Relations, and on International Relations. The Committee on French Relations has a special protégé in France, a very sad case. They have held entertainments and raised money to help this girl.

Renewing German Ties

In my last report I gave a brief account of my attempt to start the healing streams in motion in Germany. This venture into the land of the so-called "enemy" has proved the most interesting and encouraging of all our correspondence. The German children, starving for friendship as well as for food, have met us more than half way. The touching and friendly letters of the children fed by the Quakers are most appealing. They are so grateful for the Quaker food they seem to love us all. During the past three months nearly 200 letters have been received from Duisburg alone. In addition to these letters, about fifty have been received from other places in Germany and about 160 addresses. During the past year over 500 letters and addresses have been received. It is rather overwhelming, but most fascinating work. I started the correspondence with Germany among the Quaker schools in this country, but now many others have volunteered to help. Over twenty in Proctor Academy have written to Germany. They manifest a beautiful spirit. As one girl said, they are more interested in this correspondence with Germany because the need is greater there. They were left free to volunteer to write or not, and the interest and enthusiasm shown has been most gratifying. About twenty schools in Germany are now co-operating.

Such deep feeling and such hearty response from Germany I did not anticipate. Already I feel more than repaid for